

Pursuing this matter further, both the above-mentioned section and the Affordability section do not link financing of the K-University system very closely with student achievement and program quality. The Report shifts from "equity" in funding to an "adequacy" model. The proposed Quality Education Commission is derived from a new and untested concept of an "adequate level of funding" model. First, we believe that approach has yet to yield meaningful results about its successes or failures for application in a state as large and diverse as California. However, an even greater concern is that the Report does not contemplate spending reforms that focus on efficient use of monies and/or focus on effective programs.

For continuity in the ongoing structuring of its accountability system, it is important that the state build on the results of the recent Academic Performance Index (API) by ascertaining the experiences and practices of the schools most successful in increasing student achievement – including charter schools and non-public schools – and applying the information to future program and funding options. Ultimately, the funding and accountability systems should provide parents coherent data and offer them flexible options.

Of paramount concern to us and many of our constituents is that the larger portion of the student population – those who will not go on to or complete post-secondary education – seems to be once again relegated to inferior status. We know that as many as half of high school seniors leave school without the skills they need to succeed in education or the world of work and only 10% of them report having adequate career preparation. Such little mention regarding the specific and varied education needs (such as continuing classes in vocational education) of this student population seems a critical misapplication of the widely stated intent of this Master Plan effort to "address all students."

We find that this report pays an inordinate amount of attention to noncompulsory or nonexistent programs. The Proposition 10 Commission sponsorship of these recommendations excluded a significant, but less-vocal population of citizens who believe the family should remain the primary teacher and/or that there are more appropriate settings/developmental approaches for children in the earliest years. It is conceivable that state operated daycare would provide a positive environment for some children. However, many people have marked reservations about mandatory full-day kindergarten and universal preschool. Furthermore, universal preschool would absorb from \$2 billion to potentially more than \$5 billion of needed funding to help meet the education needs of students in the current system, as well as the established, but unfunded priorities and goals of prior Master Plan efforts. We believe this is a matter better addressed at the local level. For instance, Los Angeles County's Prop. 10 Commission recently established universal preschool in that area and other counties have the choice to follow suit.

Several Report proposals seem to compound the diminution of local control by court rulings and initiatives in recent decades with a major shift toward increased state governance (such as the recommendation to eliminate the State Board of Education), thereby removing a major opportunity for local input. The Report further erodes local control by pressing for greater local school tax authority for education funding, but at the same time shifting Access and Achievement responsibilities to the State.